THE

MASSACHUSETTS TEACHER.

Vol. VII, No. 10.] LORING LOTHROP, EDITOR OF THIS NUMBER. [October, 1854.

THE SCHOOL AND THE TEACHER.

I HAVE chosen as the subject of a few reflections, *the Relation of the School and Teacher to Education;* — which will be found, I trust, sufficiently extensive — perhaps indefinite — to cover any suggestions I may wish to make. Perhaps there is no greater fallacy in any current mode of expression than that which assigns to any one individual or institution, the whole, or even a principal part in the education of the young. And yet, it has come to this, that the moment the conversation turns upon education, and the means of preparing the young for the duties and responsibilities of life, we intuitively, and almost without exception, fix our minds upon the *School* and the *Teacher*.

Now in this, as it seems to me, there is a great evil. The all-wise Disposer of things never has entrusted, and, I believe, never will entrust, interests of such magnitude to one man, or to one class of means. The removal of the responsibility from all others, would be but poorly recompensed by throwing a weight on one pair of shoulders, under which, humanity itself may well stagger and call for superhuman aid. Education, development, formation of character, is the great end of existence, and shall professional Teachers, — a mere handful, with limited means and time, — have the presumption to "take the responsibility" — and bear the burden which God has diffused through the race, equalizing the pressure, and rendering it as constant as that of the very air in which we live, and move, and have our being? And may a large part, or indeed any part of the community, by the mere payment of a few dollars' tuition, or by a paltry tax, paid under an annual protest of grumbling, shake off its share of the responsibility, and bind it upon shoul-

ders, upon which it cannot rest, because laden to their utmost capacity already? No. The evil lies in a misconception of the term, education, and a partial view of its ends. It is a responsibility which men assume as human beings, not as school masters — it is inalienable.

Yet, there is reason to fear that many, perhaps most parents, indulge a feeling, — it may not be definitely stated, or even conceived, — that by voting for the annual school appropriation, or by the payment of the quarterly tuition fee, they have transferred all responsibility, at least, in regard to the intellectual culture of their children, to other hands; and should it ever occur to them, that their offspring have other interests than those of station, power, wealth, or are destined for anything beyond the workshop, the counting room, or the office, they complacently call to mind their subscriptions for the support of religious institutions, and the periodical contribution of a *dime*, to give encouragement and efficacy to the unpaid labors of the Sunday School teacher, if they happen to be at church.

The reader will not understand me as wishing to lighten the burden of responsibility which fairly rests upon the teacher. On the contrary I would have him all the more sensible of it. But there is, and must be, a perfect correspondence between a man's power and his responsibleness. They are correlative terms; either being given, the other is fairly deducible; and the attempt to load *one* with what belongs to another, is like heaping and crowding down a liquid. Ten to one it will not stay where you put it. Not one person, nor all, indeed, aided by all the influences and circumstances which naturally tend to the development and formation of character, are *unconditionally* responsible for success here; nor can one, nor *all* look upon a fully developed, and perfectly symmetrical character, and say, "Lo, *our* work." There is a *free human will* in the way, without which there could be no such thing as CHARACTER. Nay, there is a point where even the Deity himself seems to restrain and withhold his power, and in the last analysis to leave the dread decision of every question of right and wrong to the free and unconstrained choice of each human being.

We have it, I know, on the authority of the wise man, that a child trained in the way he should go, will not depart from it; and this, no doubt, is a correct statement of a *general* truth. It is the *natural*, but not *necessary* result of the means employed, and, without at all interfering with the freedom of the child, it yet confidently predicates a definite result, as the reward of parental fidelity. Still it must be borne in mind, that the general rule may have its exceptions, arising either from the refractory nature of the child, or the fact, that however faithful the parental training may be, it is yet not all the training to which the

child is subjected. "The child," says one, "is not born to hear but a few voices. It is brought at birth into a vast, we may say an infinite school. The *universe* is charged with the office of its education. Innumerable voices come to it, from all that it meets, sees, feels. It is not confined to a few books, anxiously selected for it by parental care. Nature, society, experience, are volumes opened everywhere and perpetually before its eyes. It takes lessons from all objects within the sphere of its senses, and its activity from the sun and stars, from the flowers of spring, and the fruits of autumn, from every associate, from every smiling, and every frowning countenance, from the pursuits, trades, professions of the community in which it moves, from its plays, friendships and dislikes, from the varieties of human character, and from the consequences of its actions."

Now, as it is impossible that any one can control all these circumstances, which surround the child and operate more or less remotely on him for good or evil, so, it is plain that no one can be made answerable for the resultant of all these discordant and conflicting forces. This view, however, instead of relieving any one of the obligation to use every means in his power to aid in the full development and formation of character in the young, only extends to others, the same duties, and more definitely measures the obligations of each. The teacher, perhaps, more than any other, except the parent, has the means of *interpreting* these various influences and unassorted circumstances, to the child, of leading him to educe from them, the lessons of wisdom which they contain, and of so restraining and guiding him that his *habits* shall but want confirmation to settle into *character*.

I have been led to this train of remark, partly in consequence of the common propensity, both of parents and teachers, to speak in cant terms of the weight of responsibility resting on teachers, — as though it rested on them exclusively; a load which the latter are ready to assume from an idea that it "magnifies their office;" while the former find it very convenient to transfer their sins of omission, if not of commission, to the backs of these scholastic scapegoats. My chief object, however, has been to protest against the very prevalent custom of holding teachers and the common school system responsible for every existing evil in the community; regardless of their logical connection, and winking out of sight all other agencies.

Nothing is more common, than to hear statistics of crime and its increase, spoken of in connection with our system of public instruction, in such a manner as to leave the impression that they are somehow associated together as *cause* and *effect*.

It may not be definitely stated, but there seems in some quarters, to be a feeling that the tendency of common school education is rather to increase, than to diminish crime, and some little complaint has been indulged in, that teachers and pupils are examined less in relation to the principles of morality and justice, than of grammar and arithmetic.

Now, while I consider a healthful and efficient moral training as essential to any system of education, it yet seems to me that the mode of *securing* it is not very clearly indicated by the tone of the complaint.

Should committees adopt the mode of examination suggested, there can be little doubt that many candidates would gladly submit to a rigid examination on abstract questions of right and wrong, in consideration of being allowed to *pass* lightly over grammar or figure less in arithmetic.

But after such an examination, how much more would the committee know of the *moral character* of the candidate, and of the moral *force* which he would exert on his pupils? Nay, is not this examination, itself upon the *principles* of morality, as much, and as exclusively, an intellectual exercise, as an examination in grammar? and in fact *more*, as grammar is often taught, since the former recognizes the principles of *logic*, which the latter too often utterly defies; resting for authority merely on faith in a text-book, and the infallibility of bookmakers?

The complaint, therefore, seems not to be well founded, but to rest on a false notion, that certain things, which, from their nature, "come not with observation," may be brought within the scope of the official vision of three, five, or seven men, elected for that purpose by and from the legal voters at the annual March meeting. No, the fitness of the teachers in respect to character must be come at in another way, — by a strict inquiry (as the politicians say) into his *antecedents*.

In regard to the *mode* of exerting an influence on the character of children, we think that the following quotation from the preface of the Franconia stories by Abbott, contains a valuable suggestion, and is perfectly philosophical.

"The development of the moral sentiments in the human heart, in early life," says Mr. Abbott, "and every thing in fact, which relates to the formation of character, is determined in a far greater degree by sympathy, in the influence of example, than by formal precepts, and didactic instruction. If a boy hears his father speaking kindly to a robin in spring, — welcoming its coming, and offering it food, there arises, at once, in his own mind, a feeling of kindness towards the bird, and towards all the animal creation, which is produced by a sort of sympathetic action, — a power somewhat similar to what in physical philosophy is called *induction*. On the other hand, if the father,

instead of feeding the bird, goes eagerly for a gun, in order that he may shoot it, the boy will sympathize in that desire, — and growing up under such an influence, there will be gradually formed within him through the mysterious tendency of the youthful heart to vibrate in unison with hearts that are near, a disposition to kill and destroy all helpless beings that come within his power. There is no need of any formal instruction in either case. Of a thousand children, brought up under the former of the above-described influences, nearly every one, when he sees a bird, will wish to go and get crumbs to feed it; while, in the latter case, nearly every one will just as certainly look for a stone. Thus, the growing up in the right atmosphere, rather than the receiving of the right instruction, is the condition which it is most important to secure, in plans for forming the characters of children."

A truce, then, to that morbid feeling of responsibility, which, by appropriating the duties of others, disqualifies the possessor for the discharge of his own. It is not so much a question of what the teacher shall *do*, as of what he shall *be*. Let that be attended to, and, whether in school or out, whether attending to a recitation in Wayland's Moral Science, or in Colburn's Arithmetic, a "virtue will go out from him" which will be felt by all within the sphere of his influence. It will require no direct agency of his to heal the moral maladies of his pupils, — even a stolen touch of the "hem of the garment" exerts its health-giving influence, under such conditions. On the other hand, while the moral atmosphere, by which the teacher is surrounded, is charged with pestilential exhalations from the foulness of sin, and decay of all that is fresh and pure within, no amount of sanatory measures will be able to stay the malaria, or ward off the moral epidemic from the infected region.

What, then, (we may be asked) are the appropriate, the peculiar duties of the teacher; — those which pertain to him, if not exclusively, yet more than to any others, not excepting even parents? We answer, (notwithstanding the complaint to which we have alluded) that it is to teach those branches which the pupils are sent to learn, — in which the teacher's competence has been tested by the committee, and upon which the pupils are to pass the same ordeal, as a test of their own, and their teacher's faithfulness and success. Nor is there any danger of losing anything by limiting the teacher to his proper sphere.

Nothing can be well done, when too much is attempted. The teacher must ever have some *definite object in view*, to the accomplishment of which all his efforts must tend. He must have a correct idea of the due proportion which various duties and interests bear to each other, and give to each its due proportion of time and attention. Then, in order to success in imparting

instruction, he must judiciously and successfully manage and control the school. And here he may find difficulty at the outset.

Formerly, in the school, everything was literally done by *rule*. The scholars did their sums, and the teacher the discipline, by *rule;* and many a luckless urchin, long before he knew a *rule* in arithmetic, or understood the application of a rule of *syntax*, was perfectly familiar with *one rule*, which the master applied as a *tax* upon sin! Many of my readers no doubt have *felt* this. The theory of the dependence of the mental inclinations upon the flexibility of the twig, ("just as the twig is bent the tree 's inclined,") is now, however, well nigh obsolete, and the teacher who aspires to wear *palm* in his profession, will let the *palms* of his pupils alone, and learn to *rule* his own spirit.

Here then is a problem for the teacher to solve, before he can advance a step. How shall he obtain such an ascendency over his school, as to enable him to proceed to the business of instruction?

Physical superiority will not answer the demand of the times. It must be a moral or intellectual superiority, united with a spirit of faithfulness, which cannot but inspire with respect. Nor are children slow to recognize this superiority, when judiciously manifested, under such a spirit, in a firm, decided, and generous manner. The teacher must not be behind the times, nor fail to carry with him to the school-room, those lessons, which, though learned amid the din of business, and the clatter of the machine shop, are yet but the exponents of truths of infinitely higher significance. When we see that brute force, and even the ruder properties of nature are yielding in the mechanical world, to the gentler, and more docile elements; so that our Erricsons not only "walk the ocean like things of life," but are beginning to be numbered with the "things that have *breath*," may we not hope that science is reminding us that the most efficient motives in the moral world, are those which address themselves to the *gentler* but *deeper* feelings of our nature?

Then follows the peculiar appropriate duty of the teacher to instruct his pupils in those branches of study which they were sent specially to learn. And here, if he be a *live* teacher, he will find ample scope for his ingenuity.

That the teacher may prove successful in his vocation, it is not enough that he is familiar with the branches to be taught, and is able to state rules and facts in a scientific manner. In fact, the method of instruction would seem to be *the very reverse of that of scientific statement;* and this, it appears to me, furnishes the clue to the true method of instruction in all branches.

The greatest reform, I suppose, and the one most universally admitted to be such, among us, was that introduced, from Pestalozzi, by Warren Colburn, in the method of teaching arithmetic. And what was it? Why, simply reversing the order of instruction, and instead of beginning with committing certain definitions and rules, which it was impossible for the pupil to understand, because he was entirely ignorant of the *fact* defined, he was set to counting his fingers, and performing such simple operations in numbers as he might be able. And this course was continued, till he had performed and analyzed examples containing most of the principles of common arithmetic, without saying a word of integers and fractions, addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. That is, the pupil was made acquainted with the *facts* of arithmetic, before being called on to generalize and deduce the rule — much more to *define* the technical terms.

John Locke, indeed, had said, many years before, that "nobody is made anything by hearing rules, or laying them up in memory; *practice* must settle the habit of doing, without reflecting on the rule; and you may as well hope to make a good painter or musician extempore, by merely *lecturing* on the arts of painting and music, as a coherent thinker, or strict reasoner, by a set of *rules*, showing him wherein right reason consists." This opinion, the result of the most extensive and successful observations of mental phenomena, and profound study of the laws of mind, is sustained by the experience and practice of mechanics and practical men. No one thinks of getting a trade, simply by learning the names and uses of the parts of the article to be manufactured, and committing a few *rules* as to the manner of uniting them. A greater than Locke had uttered the same truth, when he said, "If ye *do* these things, ye shall *know* of the doctrine."

It is no less true in education, than in mechanics, morals and religion. Why not, then, carry the same principle into all our teaching? — into grammar, for example; where teachers have manifested so little of common sense and philosophy, and so much of dogmatism and pedantry. Grammar professes to teach the art of speaking and writing correctly; yet we all know that scholars may be taught to name the parts of speech in a sentence, with the modifications and relations of the words, in the technical language of the books, assigning the appropriate rule of syntax, and yet be no more able to express their ideas readily and accurately, in grammatical and well constructed sentences, than a carpenter's apprentice is to build a house merely by studying the *plan* and specifications of the architect.

Neither is it strange that parents, who know nothing of grammar, except what they have acquired by the *use* of language,

— after having heard their children at the examination, prate learnedly of nouns and pronouns, etymology and syntax, modes, tenses, &c., — when they find these same prodigies incapable of writing even a tolerable letter, — should query, like the boy who had spent some time, and made much exertion to learn the alphabet, — whether, after all, it was worth while to go through so *much* to learn so *little!* Albeit a teacher ourself, we sympathize with them in their doubts! We commence with the *promise* to teach the pupil to *speak* and *write* correctly; that is, to express his ideas in correct sentences, using the proper grammatical forms, — and then go on to define certain technical terms, and tell how, by the use of these technicalities, to *analyze* language that somebody else has written, — keeping, at the same time, the real analysis buried under a mass of hard words, of which the pupil knows less than of the language to be analyzed.

Not that technical terms are unnecessary, and worthless. They give precision and exactness to scientific statements, but are the appropriate medium of thought, for those only acquainted, to some extent, at least, with the sciences or arts to which they belong. Why not, then, reverse the whole process as we have in arithmetic? Children certainly know as much of language from the daily use of it, as they do of numbers. Indeed, there are intimations that they very early recognize its general principles, to an extent sufficient to serve as a basis for a broader and more accurate knowledge of it. For instance, children, when they enter our schools, express their ideas by means of sentences. They use the singular and plural numbers appropriately.

They use the appropriate pronouns to represent a noun in certain relations, recognizing the grammatical principles of gender, person, number, case, and a variety of other things, which may be taken advantage of by the teacher. Even the errors of children in the use of language, show how early they acquire a knowledge of its *general* structure. Thus a child, who says "gooder" instead of "better," has learned the *regular* formation of the comparative degree, and is ignorant, only of the exception. When he says "mans" for "men," or "runned" for "ran," he shows that he recognizes the regular formation of the plural of nouns as well as that of the *past tense* of verbs. He has already begun to make a grammar of the language, and wants only encouragement and guidance to the accomplishment of his task.

In all cases, let the facts of language be first shown not by definitions, but by constructing and analyzing easy sentences, showing for what purpose each word is used and how it affects the *meaning* of the sentence. Thus taught, instead of loading

the memory with words to which no meaning is attached, grammar becomes purely an *intellectual* exercise, showing the power of words in modifying the sense, — that the meaning is not contained in one *mass*, but that one class of words suggests to the mind, the person of whom we are speaking, another describes the person, another tells what he does, and another how, when, or where. This, in itself, if carried no farther would perhaps furnish the best exercise possible to rouse the dormant faculties of the child, to cultivate his powers of observation, and discrimination, and to impart quickness, accuracy and intensity, of thought and expression.

Professor Gibbs says, "there can be no exercise in the whole business of instruction more useful to the mind, than the analysis of sentences in the concentrated light of grammar and logic. It brings one into the sanctuary of human thought, — all else is but standing in the outer court." It may be said, however, that the sentences required in teaching the elements, must be very simple, and the sense very obvious. It is sufficient, however, to say that they are intended for children, whose thoughts are simple, and whose minds are untrained to any severe exercise of the powers of discrimination, classification and abstraction. Besides, they are intended for illustration, and are therefore better, even for adults, than sentences (where, indeed, no new *classes* or *relations* are found,) but only where these distinctions are less obvious. That certainly is the best *illustration* of a principle, which contains it in its simplest, and most transparent form; — a fact, it would seem, not always recognized by teachers.

An important branch, closely related to grammar, and one which occupies a prominent place in the exercises of the school room, is *reading*. This exercise justly claims a large share of the teacher's time in most schools.

Is that time judiciously spent? Has the teacher a *definite aim* in each lesson? or is it merely a hum-drum exercise, which must be gone through with daily, with no particular reference to a definite result? Language has been defined as the "verbal body of thought." Reading or elocution may appropriately be styled, the *dress* of *language*. Is the garment made to fit the body? or does it hang loosely and awkwardly upon it, concealing or distorting its symmetry, as our cheap slop-work caricatures the fair proportions of the *human* form?

Not that *elocution*, as commonly understood, is to be taught to the pupils of our primary, or perhaps even grammar schools. But is it too much to expect that the *teachers* should understand the principles of elocution? How else can they teach intelligently?

We suppose that the human voice is capable of being trained to the expression of every shade of feeling, emotion, and passion, of which the mind is susceptible, and the ear is capable of being trained to an appreciation of them. We suppose also that every mode or condition of the mind, requires its peculiar and appropriate mode of expression, and the teacher who works with a purpose, will endeavor to develop the *vocal* power to use these elements with delicacy, precision and effect; and to cultivate the *ear* to a just and nice appreciation of them.

There is a special reason why this culture of the voice and ear should form a part of our school exercise. It is in youth, when the organs of speech are flexible, that they are most easily trained to these modulations. Nay, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible for an adult by the severest training, to acquire an easy and habitual use of those elements of expression, which may readily be imparted to pupils in our grammar, or even primary schools. Thus, by suitable exercises, in the articulation of the elementary sounds, and the most difficult combinations — in pitch, rate, force, inflection, emphasis, pause, and the different qualities of tone,—the ear and voice may be cultivated, long before the judgment is sufficiently matured to understand the principles of their *application*. When this early training has been thorough and correct, the reading exercise of the more advanced scholars in our grammar and high schools becomes indentical, or nearly so, with the grammatical and logical analysis of the language. — A teacher may, in fact, by proper modulations of the voice, in tone, rate, inflection, &c., exhibit to his pupil shades of meaning and feeling, in the language of an author, not only beyond what the mere *words* would suggest to them, but which he would utterly *fail* of communicating by any commentary of his own.

Indeed, *perfect reading* is the most critical and intimate analysis of language possible. It takes cognizance not only of the *physiology* of *language*,—the *body* of thought,—but of the *psychology* of the invisible *thought*.

It will be seen, therefore, that the teacher, if he attends to his own appropriate duties with fidelity, will find little time to discharge those which as appropriately belong to others; that, as we have already stated, there are limits to human responsiblity; and that the office of teacher forms no exception to the general principle; that here as elsewhere a man's ability is the full measure of his *duty;* that *every* thing is *best* done where each attends to his own business. We believe that much of the lack of parental discipline, and home instruction, of which we hear so much complaint, is due to the *false pretences* which are held out for our common schools in articles and addresses, where *moral training* and instruction are represented as their

leading and legitimate object. It is but simple *honesty* to say that such schools do not exist among us; and that the teacher who can furnish to his committee no *intellectual* results of his labors will probably be reported to have failed in the essential requisites of a common school teacher. There are some things, however, which the teacher may do, and should do, but which, it may be feared, are not always done. He may in the discipline of his school so appeal to the fairness and moral sense of his pupils, as not only not to *pervert* or *obliterate* the distinction of right and wrong, but in such a manner, as to keep constantly before them a model for study and imitation.

There is a code of morals, and system of school discipline based upon it, which, regarding stillness as the chief of all the virtues,—measures all offences by their tympanic effects.—Falsehood, deceit, &c., are faultless if noiseless; while an incalculable amount of wickedness lurks in the extremities of an unwieldy and uneasy urchin, especially if terminated by a pair of cowhide boots. What wonder, if a boy, subjected to such discipline for two, three or five years, and whose experience during the time has been such as to associate all his ideas of retribution with some such unlucky and noisy appendages, should find his primitive ideas of right and wrong, in rather a confused and chaotic state? For all this we hold the teacher responsible. The moral atmosphere of the school-room—to borrow the figure of Abbott—should be pure, but all the activity and skill of the teacher will be required in the direct line of his professional duties; and you may as well hold the lawyer, physician, and clergyman severally responsible for the professional duties of the others, as to unite them all in the profession of teaching. We have hinted at some of the methods of instruction in a few of the branches taught in our schools. The *principles* of instruction which these hints are intended to illustrate will apply equally to all other branches.

Let no one, however, suppose that *any one* method will answer at all times, and for all scholars. In the words of Martineau, the "teacher needs that variety and fertility of resource, that command of the several paths of access to truth, which are given only, by a thorough survey of the field on which he stands. The instructor needs to have a full perception, not merely of the internal contents, but also of the external relation, of that which he unfolds; as the astronomer knows but little, if ignorant of the place and laws of sun and moon, he has examined only their mountains and spots." And he adds, "Hence it is that the most cultivated minds are usually the most patient, most clear, most rationally progressive; most studious of accuracy in details, because not shut up impatiently within them, as absolutely limiting the view, but quietly contemplating them

from without in their relation to the whole." As a general result, then, of all our inquiries thus far, we see that the teacher, (of *all* men) should possess that rare *versatility* of talent, which will enable him to meet the various wants of different minds, and of different stages of development. His mind should be a perfect kaleidoscope, exhibiting new and varying forms and combinations of the truths he would illustrate, with each successive change of circumstance.

It is under this condition of mental activity that the teacher himself can have any other than a one-sided and partial view of truth; much more that he can make such an exhibition of it to his pupils, as to secure to them a thorough acquaintance with it, in all its various phases and modifications. And where such activity exists, under the guidance of good judgment and united with a spirit of faithfulness, it cannot fail of ultimate success.

MR. COLBURN'S REMARKS

BEFORE THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION, ON ARITHMETIC.

At the close of Mr. Hedge's remarks before the American Institute of Instruction, on the subject of Arithmetic, Mr. Dana P. Colburn, Principal of the State Normal School, Providence, R. I., continued the discussion as follows:—

Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen:—As it is probably the wish of all present that the discussions before this Institute shall be of as practical a character as possible, I shall avoid all mere theories, and endeavor to offer such suggestions as my experience and observation have convinced me may be of value.

The subject of Arithmetic, as I understand it, is included within these limits:— To be a perfect arithmetician, a person must in the first place have a knowledge of the nature and uses of numbers and of the various methods of representing them. In the second place, he must have a knowledge of the nature and uses of numerical operations and the methods of indicating and performing them. These operations are four in number, viz.: addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Thirdly and lastly, he needs, in addition to these, such mental discipline as shall enable him to determine from the conditions of any given problem the operations necessary for its solution.

A person with these qualifications I hold to be a perfect arithmetician; such as a teacher should strive to make of his

pupils. And in trying to accomplish this, he should endeavor so to shape his course as to secure the greatest possible amount of mental discipline, the best possible habits of thought, and the best preparation possible for the active duties of life.

The first thing to be done in teaching this department is, to make the scholars acquainted with the nature and use of numbers. The idea of number is of itself an abstraction. We have then to make our pupils acquainted with an abstract idea, and, as we were told in the lecture yesterday, we can only impart abstract ideas by first presenting a representation of them in the concrete. The first idea of number then must be given by reference to visible objects, as marbles, pebbles, pens, books, &c., — no matter what they are, if they are such as can be easily exhibited to the pupil or readily handled by him. He should apply the term "*one*" to each of these, and to a variety of other objects, absent as well as present, and to words and actions as well as things.

This might perhaps be the first lesson. I would give this great variety of illustrations because it seems important to leave in the mind a clear idea of unity, the abstract number one, as applicable to any object, and yet independent of all. Moreover unity is the base of all numbers, and unless its nature is understood, no higher number can be comprehended.

The pupil is now prepared to pass to the next number, *two*. To teach this I would exhibit any object and let the pupil apply the term *one* to its name, as "*one book*"; then exhibit another "*one book*," then both together. They may be called "*one book and one book*," for the present, or we may at once give the name "*two*"; it matters not which, for it is the idea of the union of one and one which is to be taught, and words must be subordinate to ideas always. These illustrations should be extended and varied till *two* is as familiar as *one*.

Instruction should now be commenced in the various numerical operations, always presenting them first in the concrete, and illustrating each to the eye. Thus, [taking a book] "How many books have I?" If I should get another how many should I have? [Taking another] "How many have I?" How many more than before I took the last? If I should put one away, how many should I then have? &c., &c.

Then without exhibiting the objects, "How many peas are 1 pea and 1 pea? 1 pea from 2 peas leaves how many peas? 1 pea and how many peas are 2 peas?" &c., &c. And finally such abstract questions as "How many are 1 and 1? 1 and how many are 2? 2 are how many more than 1? 1 is how many less than 2? 1 from 2 are how many? 1 from how many leaves 1? 2 less 1? 2 less how many are 1? how many from 2 leave 1?" &c., &c.

I would present this great variety of questions and exercises to insure that the pupils shall have at the outset a true idea of the nature and use of numbers and numerical operations; that they shall *master* each number before passing to a larger one, and be able to compare each with every preceding one. Such thoroughness is essential to all true progress, and a want of it is the cause of a greater part of the difficulties which so often beset the path of the student in this department of science. If the teacher will see to it that each step is taken at the right time, and understood when taken; that each process follows naturally from a preceding one, and is mastered when it is introduced; that the mind of the pupil is ever kept active and his attention fixed; the pupil will never, from the beginning of his course to the end, encounter any insurmountable or formidable difficulty. The questions in abstract numbers should be given very rapidly, to secure promptness, rapidity, and accuracy of thought, and fixed attention.

Simple practical problems, (stories, they may be called, to add to their interest,) should now be given; as John had 1 cent, his father gave him 1 more; after which he lost 1. He soon after found 1 by the road side, and spent one for candy, and 1 for raisins. His mother then gave him 1 for being a good boy, and again he found one. He now gave 2 to a poor old woman, and did an errand for which he received 2 cents. He spent a cent for nuts, and received one for doing an errand. He then had the misfortune to lose 1 cent, how many did he have left?

This question involves only the numbers *one* and *two*, and is so simple that the smallest pupil can comprehend and perform it, yet it requires for its solution a continuous train of thought and investigation, and reasoning processes as complete as any required in arithmetic. Every scholar who solves it as it is given, must give his individual attention to it; must follow through a continuous train of thought; must note each condition, determine what operation it requires, perform the operation, and determine what use to make of the result; in short, must concentrate his entire mental energies, for the time being, on the work he is performing. How can such work be other than valuable to him? How can it do otherwise than discipline his mind and give him intellectual strength and vigor? And what more profitable work can he be called on to perform? What work will as surely lay a foundation for real or rapid after-progress?

The other numbers should be introduced in the same manner, and similar exercises should be given in each till the first ten numbers are learned and mastered in all their various combinations. This done, the foundation is laid; the most difficult

work accomplished. All else connected with the mechanical operations of addition and subtraction, the basis of every other, is but an application and extension of operations on the numbers from one to ten. The child who knows that 4 and 3 are 7, has but to know the decimal formation of the higher numbers, to know that 40 and 30 are 70; that 400 and 300 are 700; that 4 trillions and 3 trillions are 7 trillions, &c., &c. So with 5 and 4, 15 and 4, 25 and 4, 85 and 4, 35,000 and 4000, &c., &c. Again 4 from 7, 40 from 70, 4000 from 7000, 24,000,-000 from 27,000,000, &c., &c., exhibit the same dependence. Again, 4 times 3, 4 times 30, 4 times 30,000, 4000 times 3, &c., &c., are further illustrations of it.

Such being the case, it is of the utmost importance that here in the primitive operations, we should be especially thorough, and that whatever amount of time is necessary to give the pupil a mastery of this fundamental work should be given to it. These operations, which we call addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, are all of like nature, all dependent on the memory. For instance, the child knows that 4 and 3 are 7. How does he know it? He once saw 4 things, then 3 things, then the two collections combined, and by counting he found that the united collection contained 7 things. This is true whatever are the objects, and it only remains to commit it to memory. At first it may be difficult to call up the idea of 7 whenever 4 and 3 are to be added, but by continued repetitions the thing becomes so familiar that the mention of 4 and 3 suggests 7 to the mind without conscious effort. So with all other of these primitive combinations. If I speak to you of 8 and 9, the idea of 17 flashes into your minds as instantaneous and as certainly as though I had presented it by its more abbreviated representative, its name, *seventeen*. So the child should be thought at each step of his progress. He should be drilled now on one form, now on another, till these combinations are as familiar with him as with you, and as firmly impressed on his mind as they are in yours.

These mechanical operations on the ten primitive numbers, however dry subjects of discourse they may be, and however trifling and unworthy of attention they may appear, are of the utmost importance in the science and art of Arithmetic. They are just what the letters of the alphabet are to reading. We *expect* to have *all* our pupils acquire such a power over the letters of the alphabet as to be able to call each printed word the moment their eyes fall upon it. No one is a tolerable reader who cannot do this readily and easily, and no amount of labor necessary to give this power is regarded as too much to devote to the *primary* lessons in reading. So the child should be drilled in this department of numbers, till he has such a power

over them that the instant his eye falls on the numbers to be combined, he can seize the result and use it. Anything less than this is insufficient.

This power over numbers is as easily acquired as the power over the letters of the alphabet, to which I have referred. And how is that obtained? The child first learns some of the letters. Then the teacher combines them in a word, as CAT. The teacher calls the word; lets the child call it after him; points out the letters separately and lets the child distinguish each; points out the word in another place to see if the child can recognize it; requires the child to point it out and call it, now by itself, now to select it from other words; and so he goes over it again and again, day after day if need be, till the word is *learned*. We have all been taught in some such way as this, and what a power do we possess in the art of reading. We take a book which we have never before seen, and which treats on an unfamiliar subject, yet we can call the printed words as rapidly as we can speak. Nay, more; the eye and the mind can recognize them more rapidly than the tongue can utter them. So skilled may we become in the mere mechanical art of reading that we may read pages aloud, calling every word correctly, and yet not note a single thought which has been expressed. In reading, the eye is usually in advance of the tongue. Who that reads much aloud, has not at some time or other found his eye glancing at words printed in one place, his tongue pronouncing words printed in another, and his mind dwelling on thoughts expressed by words printed in still another?

A similar course would give our pupils as great a power over numbers. Accountants often acquire it. An accountant once told me that in adding up long leger columns, he had often been surprised to find his eye at the top of the column, the result of the addition at his tongue's end, while, as far as he knew, his mind was engaged on numbers expressed between the bottom and top.

In passing to operations involving higher numbers, they should be so presented as to exhibit their dependence on the primitive ones, and to secure at once accuracy, confidence and rapidity. A thorough drill should be given upon the mechanical processes, and to insure the best possible results, the exercises should be given in a great variety of forms. I will suggest a few of them.

How many are five, nine, eight, seven, four, nine, six, eight, seven, six, eight, five, nine, three and six?

How many are twenty-four, plus eight, plus six, minus nine, minus four, plus seven, minus eight, minus five, plus seven, plus nine, plus eight, minus four, minus six, plus two?

How many are five times seven, plus one, divided by six, multiplied by nine, minus six, divided by six, multiplied by eight, plus nine, plus six, plus five, divided by seven?

Multiply three-fourths of twelve, by two-sevenths of twenty-eight, add one-eighth of forty, divide by one-seventh of forty-nine, multiply by three-eighths of sixteen, and add four-ninths of eighteen.

These are but a few of the forms in which such exercises may be given. The questions should be given as rapidly as the condition of the class will allow, and scholars may be profitably exercised upon them, in connection with other work, at all stages of their progress. No very great amount of practice is necessary to give pupils a power of performing such operations as rapidly as the tongue can indicate them. I have to-day given these examples no more rapidly than I am in the habit of given them to my own pupils, or than they are given daily in some of the Public Schools of this city.

By such exercises, pupils not only gain an almost perfect command over numerical operations, but they acquire great mental activity and quickness of thought, and a power of concentrating their undivided energies on the process they are required to follow. They must shut out from their mind, during the operation, everything which does not belong to it, or they cannot obtain the result; for if a single number or step of the operation is lost, it cannot be recalled, nor is there any time to rectify errors. Such work, then, aside from its arithmetical utility, cannot fail to give much valuable mental discipline.

The reasoning processes of Arithmetic should receive the careful attention of the teacher. They are sometimes apparently difficult and complicated, but may always be reduced to very simple elements. Those involved in Multiplication and Division can be the most easily exhibited in such a discussion as this, and I will ask your attention to them for a few moments. Suppose that the question, "How much will four apples cost at three cents a piece?" should be proposed to a class. The answer promptly given will be 12 cents. "But how do you know?" says the teacher. "Because 4 times 3 are 12," replies the scholar Mary.

But this is not enough. The scholar should trace clearly and state the connection between the problem and the result, 4 times 3, but he should first be led to see the deficiency of his former answer. To show him this, the teacher may reply, "Yes, I know that 4 times 3 cents are 12 cents, and so 4 times 4 cents are 16 cents. Why do you not say 16 cents then?" "Because the apples cost 3 cents a piece; not 4." "Then why not say 15 cents, because 5 times 3 cents are 15 cents?" "Because there were only 4 apples, and they cost 3 cents

apiece." The pupil will now see that to make his reasoning perfect, he must take into account the number of apples and the price of each, and will after a little effort be able to give a perfectly rigid demonstration, similar to the following. "If one apple cost 3 cents, 4 apples will cost 4 times 3 cents, which are 12 cents. Therefore 4 apples at 3 cents a piece cost 12 cents."

It is much better that the scholar should thus discover this process for himself, than that the teacher should give him an arbitrary form for it, for he will better understand and appreciate its nature. Moreover he will be thrown more fully upon his own resources, and will do more of the work for himself. It should be always borne in mind that it is work which the scholar does for himself which educates him. The work done by the teacher cannot do it. He is the best teacher who throws the most work on his pupils, and does the least direct work for them. Indeed, were it possible for a teacher to stand before his school and do nothing himself, yet keep every scholar profitably and constantly employed in performing the appropriate work of the school-room, he should do it; and he who could do it, would best deserve the title of Model Teacher.

The reasoning process now given, simple as it is, is the key to all processes in Multiplication which are required in Arithmetic, even those which depend directly on Algebraical or Geometrical principles. There is not in Arithmetic, from beginning to end, a question requiring a multiplication not depending directly on Algebra or Geometry, which does not require essentially this process. By fully mastering it, then, in its simplest form, we are preparing to refer to the same simple principles, questions apparently entirely unlike.

Thus 4 yards equal how many feet? This question is, in works on Written Arithmetic, classed with questions in "Reduction Descending," and a special rule is given for their solution. But it requires (the Tables being learned) no new principle, reasoning process, or operation. Thus since one yard equals 3 feet, 4 yards must equal 4 times 3 feet, which are 12 feet.

Reduce 4 to thirds. This is classed with questions in the "Reduction of Whole Numbers to Improper Fractions," and is honored with a new rule. The simple solution, however, is, "Since one equals three-thirds, 4 must equal 4 times three-thirds, which are 12-thirds."

"What will 4 yards of cloth cost at 3-twentieths of a dollar per yard?" This again is thrown into a new class, viz.:— "To multiply a Fraction by a Whole Number," and has its peculiar rule. The soution is however as before. "If one yard costs 3-twentieths of a dollar, 4 yards will cost 4 times 3-twentieths

of a dollar, which are 12-twentieths of a dollar." The list might be extended indefinitely, but cases enough have been given to show the absurdity of the common classification, or rather the absurdity of requiring scholars to burden their memories with formal arbitrary rules. I have given four questions, all, as we have seen, alike in principle, and all involving the same reasoning process; yet by the system of rules, the pupil is required to learn them as though they had nothing to do with each other. He first learns his rule for Simple Multiplication, then, after turning over a few pages, he comes to Reduction Descending, when he must learn a new rule, and how to work by it; a little further on is Reduction of Whole Numbers to Fractions, with a new rule to be learned, and a process presented as new to be mastered; and so on again to Multiplication of a Fraction by a Whole Number, when the same process is to be repeated. Now is not this unphilosophical? Does it not render the subject altogether too complicated, and impose a great amount of needless labor on the pupil?

In Division, there are two forms of reasoning process corresponding to two distinct classes of questions. One of them will be required in the solution of the question, "How many apples at 3 cents apiece can be bought for 12 cents?" The reasoning process required is in spirit as follows:—"If for 3 cents one apple can be bought, for 12 cents as many apples can be bought as there are times 3 cents in 12 cents, which are 4 times. Therefore 4 apples at 3 cents apiece can be bought for 12 cents."

The following questions require this process;

12 yards equal how many feet?

12 thirds equal how many ones?

How many yards of cloth at 3-twentieths of a dollar per yard, can be bought for 12-twentieths of a dollar?

To illustrate the other form of reasoning process, let us consider the question, If 4 apples cost 12 cents, what will 1 apple cost? The reasoning process is, If 4 apples cost 12 cent, one apple will cost one fourth of 12 cents, which is 3 cents.

The following questions require the same process, which, as will be perceived, recognizes the principle of Fractions.

What will 1-fourth of a barrel of flour cost at 8 dollars per barrel?

If 4-sevenths of a yards of cloth cost 12 cents, what will 1 seventh of a yard cost?

The processes thus hastily sketched are all which can occur in Multiplication and Division, except when we come into the province of Algebra or Geometry. They will not always assume precisely the forms which have been given, but in spirit and essence they will be the same. And they are the key to all

operations in Multiplication and Division. Equally simple and general are the processes required in Addition and Subtraction. We would not be understood to say that no problem requires the application of more than one of these processes; far from it. A problem may require several of them, or that the same process shall be many times repeated; but each process shall of itself be simple, and in all such cases the original problem can be resolved into a series of simple ones, each as simple and easy of solution as those we have given. We say, then, that these processes are the key to all arithmetical operations, and submit the question,—Is it not better, is it not more philosophical to require our pupils perfectly to master these, and to base their work upon them, and learn every where to apply them, than to burden their memory with so many arbitrary rules and useless distinctions? In the one case we are teaching principles, developing the reasoning powers, and cultivating the whole mind, while in the other we are teaching forms and cultivating the memory only.

In Mental Arithmetic we take such a course as has been recommended. We do teach principles, we do require our pupils to follow out rigid reasoning processes. What teacher in using Warren Colburn's First Lessons ever thought of giving his pupils a rule? Yet every one praises that book as the best ever written; every one who ever studied it speaks of it as the one from which he derived his most valued arithmetical knowledge and discipline. Why is this? Simply, I fancy, because it has no rules, because it throws the pupils so much upon their own resources, compelling them to learn principles, to follow out rigid reasoning processes, and connected trains of thought, to examine and know for themselves the necessity and reason of the steps they take and the operations they perform.

When the scholar has been through Mental Arithmetic and takes up Written, he seems to have entered on an entirely different field, where all that he has formerly learned is to be thrown away. At the very outset he is required to learn an arbitrary rule, then another, then another, &c., &c., learning each as a new and distinct thing having nothing to do with any other principle or process, or with anything previously learned, when perhaps precisely the same operations may be required, and the same principles involved in all of them. Is this philosophical? What difference is there between Mental and Written Arithmetic, to require so wide a difference in our methods of teaching them? The only real difference in their nature is that in Mental Arithmetic we must retain in the mind the numbers we use and the results we obtain, while in Written Arithmetic we write them, and thus relieve the memory.

Another point which I would suggest is, that scholars ought always to prove their work for themselves, instead of verifying it by comparison with the work or answer of another. I believe that the practice of placing the answers to arithmetical problems within reach of the pupil, either in the text-book or key, is always injurious.

In the first place such tests are unpractical, for they can never be resorted to in the problems of real life. What merchant ever thinks of looking in a text-book or key, or of relying on his neighbor to learn whether he has added a column correctly, drawn a correct balance between the debit and credit sides of an account, or made a mistake in finding the amount of a bill?

When a pupil, having left the school-room, performs a problem of real life, how anxious is he to know whether his result be correct! Neither text-book nor key can aid him now, and he is forced to rely on himself and his own investigations to determine the truth or falsity of his work. If he must always do this in real life, and if his school course is to be a preparation for the duties of real life, ought he not to do it as a learner in school? Is it right to lead him to rely on such false tests?

But the labor of proving an operation is usually as valuable arithmetical work as was the labor of performing it; and it will oftentimes make a process or solution appear perfectly simple and clear, when it would otherwise have seemed obscure and complicated.

Again, the science of Mathematics, of which Arithmetic is a branch, is an exact science; it dwells in no uncertainties, its reasonings are always accurate, and, if based on true premises, must always lead to true results. In Arithmetic, the pupil may always *know* that a certain step is a true one, and one which he has a right to take. He may *know* whether he has taken it correctly, and thus be certain of the truth of his first result. He may be as sure of the truth of his second step and second result, and of his third and his fourth. And when he reaches the end, and obtains his final result, he may be as sure of the truth of that as of any preceding; so sure that he will be willing to abide by it and stake his reputation upon it. And the subject should always be so presented that the pupil will be forced to apply such tests, and to determine for himself the truth and accuracy of his processes, and thus be led to form a habit of patient investigation and just self-reliance.

With these views, then, I would do away with everything like an answer in the text-book, and with everything like a key. I would from the first throw the scholars on their own resources, and hold them strictly responsible for the accuracy of their work. Such a course, faithfully followed, would almost entirely

prevent the formation of those careless habits of work which scholars so usually form. How often may we see a scholar studying with book and slate before him in a manner something like the following. The book is open perhaps at simple addition. Every problem on the page is one in addition, and usually all the numbers in each problem are to be added together. The pupil knows this, and so, without reading the problem he is to solve, or noting its conditions, he writes all the numbers mentioned in it, adds the first column, compares the unit's figure of the result with that of the answer in the book,—if alike, right and the second column is added; if unlike, wrong, and the whole is removed, only to be re-written as carelessly as before, or to prepare the way for the call, "Please to show me how to do this sum."

Is not this a true representation of what has taken place again, and again, and again in our schools, and is called the study of arithmetic? But it is no study, it is a caricature on study. And can we wonder that pupils who pass through our schools subject in a greater or less degree to such influences, fail to become fitted for business pursuits and duties? Go to the counting-room and ask the merchant if the boys who come to him from the school with the reputation of being good arithmeticians are prepared for an accountant's duties, and he will tell you that he would scarcely trust one of them to add up a leger column, or make out a simple bill. Ask him again if he follows the processes he learned at school, and he will reply that he never uses them, and has entirely forgotten them; yet he will put our school-boys to shame by the rapidity and accuracy with which he performs his work; and he has acquired this power by being thrown on his own resources, by being forced to throw away all arbitrary rules, by learning to consider each example by itself, by learning to seize it in its most vulnerable point, and perform it in the most ready manner possible. So it should be in our schools.

Is it asked, "Would you have no rules?" I think them useless, unless for the operations depending directly on Algebra and Geometry; for so long as the scholar finds it difficult to reason out and explain fully his processes, the labor of doing it will be the most profitable which he can perform; and when it becomes perfectly easy, the whole thing will be understood, and no rule will be needed, other than that which the scholar himself will give in describing his processes.

I have thrown out these sentiments, Fellow Teachers, for your consideration. I have spoken very freely and frankly, and have endeavored to give my honest opinions and views, assured that they will receive such treatment at your hands as they may deserve.

ON SPEAKING THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE WELL.

By the phrase "speaking the English language" we mean to include reading, conversation and what is commonly called public speaking. In this brief article we shall confine ourselves to one point — the correct and tasteful utterance of words — good pronunciation — without entering at all upon the broader fields of discussion in regard to the selecting and arranging of words in sentences, in accordance with the principles of good taste. We all know that the laws of our language are established by the usages of our best speakers and writers; that is, those who *pronounce* our language in the most accurate and agreeable manner; and those who arrange words into sentences in such a happy style as to attract and secure the attention of the reader, and to impress upon his mind the authors' ideas, and at the same time to gratify a cultivated taste.

The space allowed for this article will confine us to a few illustrations of the evils of *bad pronunciation*. Vulgar forms of speech corrupt the tastes and minds of a community.

> "Words lead to things: a scale is more precise, —
> Coarse speech, bad grammar, swearing, drinking, vice."

It has often been asserted, and we presume it is true, that there is not a country on the face of the earth in which so large a proportion of the population speak the national language *decently well*, as in the United States. But on the other hand we believe it to be equally true that there is not a civilized nation under the sun in which *so small* a proportion of the *educated* people are in the habit of speaking the language of the country *very well*.

In New England all Americans can read and converse *tolerably well;* and a large proportion of the men will venture upon public speaking on some of our various occasions for discussions.

But how few in comparison with the whole number of *well educated* persons among us have ever acquired an *elegant pronunciation* of our language — have ever accustomed their organs of speech to stamp upon all their words the true sounds and accents which give them a completeness and finish as they fall from their lips like perfect coins from the mint.

We do not consult our dictionaries enough, nor are we sufficiently careful to ascertain precisely what sounds the marks used by the lexicographer are designed to indicate. And moreover we do not cultivate our ears enough to perceive many of the nicer distinctions in the sounds of our language, nor do we train our organs of voice sufficiently to make them utter with ease and elegance these important distinctions. We will allow that the distinct and beautiful pronunciation of a *well educated*

English gentleman or lady puts to shame the less elegant utterance of our best conversers; but we should not on that account imitate all Englishmen, cockneys and all.

Cockney, says Noah Webster, is "most probably" derived from an old Latin word that used to signify kitchen, cook, or waiter at table. One of the early English poets seems to have used the word in the latter sense:

> At that feast were they served in rich array,
> Every five and five had a Cockeney.

In England this cockney dialect, or "Kitchen English," is confined below stairs, and is never allowed to appear in any well-bred and well-educated family in the realm. But in this country, unfortunately, certain forms of this vulgar speech have been permitted to come into the parlor, and mingle in good society. We laugh at certain forms of Cockney-English, while at the same time we imitate others equally offensive to good taste. When we hear an Englishman speak of "*h*eating 'am and *h*eggs," "'aving 'ot cffee," for his breakfast, we look knowing at each other, and say something about Yorkshire cockneys.

But when a young glove-fingered London cockney comes here, either to see the country or to transact some business, he presents his letters of introduction and receives some social attentions. In conversation, he informs our young ladies and gentlemen that "the English clergy always wear *wite* cravats *wen* in the pulpit, *wich* he observes is not the uniform custom in this country, *were* he has been." Immediately young America begins to imitate this cockney English, and he is soon heard speaking of the "*weels* of carriages," the "*wig* party," "steam *wistles* on locomotives," &c. Even blushing young ladies have been suspected of *wispering* to each other about young gentlemen's *wiskers*. Old and young sit down together in the evening to play *wist*.

This vulgar practice of omitting to sound the *h* when it comes after *w*, in a large class of words in our language, has been tolerated so long, that it is beginning to be considered a *respectable* if not an *elegant* way of speaking. But it is Cockney-English; and is fit only for a kitchen dialect.

Nowadays a young boy begins by calling one of his playthings a *wip*, and then he boasts of his skill in *wittling*, and when he comes to be — as he sometimes does — an old boy, he ends by calling for more *wiskey* punch.

The schools are fighting against this detestable cockney style of speaking, but the street practice and the home practice are forming habits which are already getting the balance of power in the schools. We appeal to the ladies, who as a class always

speak better English than gentlemen, to exclude this and all other cockneyisms from their society, and to teach their children to shun these vulgar pronunciations as they would serpents. Americans ought to speak their language with as much purity and taste as the nobility of England, who draw their language from "the well of English, undefiled."

WHIPPING BY PROXY.

It is a very curious fact, that in the early times of English history, the sons of great men used to be whipped by proxy. The following passage displays in true colors the harshness of the aristocratical spirit prevalent in those days.

"Of all the acts of cruelty exercised on the young students of that age, none was so unjust as the practice that prevailed of *whipping them by proxy*. In an old comedy written by Christopher Tye, is a dialogue to that purpose. Tye and Cranmer are met by one Brown, a young student of music, bearing the Prince's cloak and hat. Cranmer inquires what is become of the Prince, and is told that he is at tennis with the Marquis of Dorset; upon which the following dialogue ensues:

Cranmer.—Goe, beare this youngster to the chappell straight, and bid the maister of the children whippe him well;
The Prince will not learne, Sir, and you shall smart for it.
Browne.—O good, my lord, I'll make him ply his book to-morrow.
Cranmer.—That shall not serve your turne. Away, I say.
[*Exit Browne.*]

So, Sir, this police was well devised; since he was whipt thus
For the Prince's faults.
His Grace hath got more knowledge in a month,
Than he attained in a year before;
For still the fearful boy, to save his breech,
Doth hourly haunt him wheresoe'er he goes.
Tye.—Tis true, my lord, and now the Prince perceives it;
As loath to see him punish't for his faults,
Plies it on purpose to redeem the boy."

The practice of whipping poor children for the faults of their superiors, probably had its rise in the education of Prince Edward, and may be traced down to the time of Charles I. Bishop Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, mentions Barnaby Fitz-Patrick as *whipping boy* to Prince Edward; and the same author, in his History of his Own Times, takes notice of Mr. Murray, *whipping boy* to Charles I.

Resident Editors' Table.

GEORGE ALLEN, Jr., ... *Boston.*
C. J. CAPEN, ... *Dedham.*
} RESIDENT EDITORS. {
ELBRIDGE SMITH, *Cambridge.*
E. S. STEARNS, .. *Framingham.*

[For the Massachusetts Teacher.]

BRIDGEWATER NORMAL ASSSOCIATION.

THE Thirteenth Annual Convention of the graduates and students of the Bridgewater State Normal School, was held in Bridgewater, on Wednesday, Aug. 16th, 1854.

The Association met at an early hour at Normal Hall. Here, for a season, friends and classmates interchanged friendly greetings, and the merry tone and animated countenance betokened the pleasure felt by each one of the company, at being present at another of the Normal *Reunions.*

At 10 o'clock A. M., the Convention was called to order by the President, Albert G. Boyden, Esq., of Salem. After reading of the Secretary's Report, a Committee of five, consisting of Messrs. James T. Allen, R. Edwards, A. Wood, J. D. Whitmore, and W. N. Clark, was appointed to report a list of officers for the ensuing year. The Committee reported as follows:

Prof. E. A. H. Allen, of Troy, N. Y., President; E. C. Hewett, of Bridgewater, Vice President; B. C. Vose, of Roxbury, Secretary; J. H. Root, of Byfield, Treasurer; Geo. A. Walton, of Lawrence, Chief Marshal.

This report was unanimously adopted. The Treasurer's report was read by R. C. Metcalf, and accepted. R. Edwards, Esq., Chairman of the Committee appointed last year to procure a Lithograph of Mr. Tillinghast, late Principal of the Bridgewater State Normal School, reported verbally that several hundred copies had been prepared for sale among the members, and suggested various methods of disposing of the same.

Mr. D. P. Colburn made a brief speech, paying an eloquent tribute of esteem and regard to Nicholas Tillinghast, Esq., who from continued ill health, had been compelled to resign the office of Principal of the Bridgewater State Normal School, the duties of which he had so long and faithfully performed.

Feeling and appropriate remarks were also made by Mr. Edwards and Mr. Walton. Each spoke of the debt of gratitude due Mr. T. for his efficient and long-continued labors. As an indication of the feelings of the Association towards our respected and beloved teacher, it was voted *unanimously*, that a Committee of five be appointed to procure a portrait of Mr. T. to be placed in Normal Hall, at the expense of the Association.

The President stated that the sum raised and presented to Mr. Tillinghast one year ago, amounted to $475. Mr. T. through the President returned his sincere thanks to the members for this kind testimonial of their regard. At 12 o'clock, the Association, under the direction of the Chief Marshal, and led by the Bridgewater Cornet Band, marched in procession to the Unitarian Church. The church was well filled by teachers and other friends of education.

The exercises were introduced by a voluntary by the Normal Choir. Selections from Scripture were read and prayer offered by Rev. T. E. Bliss, of Middleboro, Chaplain of the day.

An original Hymn by a lady member, was then sung, after which the President announced Prof. E. A. H. Allen, of Troy, N. Y., as the Orator of the day. He stated as his subject, "What constitues a true method in Teaching."

The Speaker enlarged upon the vital necessity to the Teacher of *system* and *method*. Without care in arrangement and classification, little progress among pupils can be expected. The danger of servile imitation, want of individuality, and of being tied to an arbitrary set of regulations, was adverted to. There is no principle of American Education so important as that of the *mind's freedom*. The teacher should hold himself in readiness to receive truth from every source. He should study *Human Nature*, and become fully acquainted with the dispositions of his pupils. A frequent cause of failure is *too much regard* to *words*, without reference to the *ideas* which they convey. It is not enough that the pupil be made to commit to memory certain words, — the truths which they express should be felt.

We have not attempted to give even an outline of this admirable address. It was clear, logical, eloquent, and *eminently practical*, and was attentively listened to. Mr. Allen is a gentleman of distinguished, scientific and literary attainments, and is a graduate of whom the Bridgewater State Normal School may justly be proud.

On the conclusion of the exercises in the Church, the Association proceeded in procession to the Town Hall, which was tastefully decorated for the occasion. Here a bountiful collation was provided, to which ample justice was done.

At a proper time, the President introduced the intellectual repast by an appropriate address.

Speeches full of interest were made by Marshall P. Conant, Esq., the present able and distinguished Principal of the Bridgewater State Normal School, Thos. Sherwin, Esq., Principal of the English High School, Boston, Dana P. Colburn, Esq., Principal of the Rhode Island Normal School, Richard Edwards,

Esq., Assistant Secretary of the Board of Education, Rev. Mr. Allen, of Bangor, Rev. Mr. Bliss, of Middleboro', Rev. Mr. Rodman, of Bridgewater, John Kneeland, Esq., of Dorchester, and E. C. Hewett, Esq., of Bridgewater. Perfect silence pervaded the Hall, interrupted only by bursts of applause.

The Association adjourned to Normal Hall, where some necessary business was performed. Appropriate mention was made of the recent death of C. C. Greene, of Rhode Island, a brother Normal and distinguished teacher.

The exercises of "*Convention Day*" ended with a social levee at the Town Hall, which was fully attended. The inspiriting music of the Bridgewater Band added much to the enjoyment of the occasion.

At a late hour, the members separated, well pleased with the exercises of the day, and feeling strengthened to perform with more faithfulness than ever before, the duties of their noble vocation. ALBERT STETSON, *Secretary*.

EDUCATIONAL MEETING.

THE Quarterly Meeting of the Teachers' Association of San Francisco, was held last Friday evening, at the Washington street Baptist Chapel, Mayor Garrison presiding. The meeting was opened with prayer, by Rev. Mr. Brierly, and singing by the choir. A fine Essay, on the importance of cultivating a "Love for the Beautiful," was then read by Mr. J. Swett, Principal of the First District School; after which Mr. W. H. O'Grady, City Superintendent of Schools, delivered a very interesting and appropriate Address to the Teachers, on topics connected with their duties and with general education.

Hon. Paul K. Hubbs, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, fortunately being present, then arose and addressed the meeting in his usually able, interesting and highly felicitous manner. His remarks were received with much demonstration of feeling on the part of his audience, and he sat down in the midst of great applause!

Rev. Mr. Gray, in a few practical remarks alluded to the great improvement in the schools during his short residence here and to the amount of natural talent he had discovered in them. He was followed by Rev. M. C. Briggs, who briefly but elo quently touched upon the distinguishing characteristics of American Education.

Mr. Webb, late Mayor of Salem, Mass., made some very happy remarks appropriate to the occasion; as also Mr. Wells, of the Board of Education, referring to the Superintendent's report, found on our first page.

Mayor Garrison stated that $40,000 had been appropriated for the purpose of erecting new school-houses. A few months ago the schools were kept in hovels, now they were in comfortable rooms; and in a few months he hoped that school edifices would be erected which would do honor to the city of San Francisco.—*The Pacific.*

NINTH QUARTERLY REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Mr. Wm. H. O'Grady, Superintendent of Public Schools in San Francisco, has favored us with a copy of his quarterly report presented to the Board of Education.

It is a clear and well-written statement of the condition of our Free Schools, the number of teachers and pupils they contain, studies pursued, improvements made and the expenses incurred by them for the last quarter.

These schools are seven in number, located in different parts of our city, and have furnished instruction in all to some 1454 children, as will appear by the following exhibit.

STUDIES, ETC., ETC.

Whole No. pupils in attendance during terms,	1454	Preceding term,		1399
Boys,	840	...	...	785
Girls	614	...	...	614
In Orthography,	1454	...	...	1399
In Reading,	1454	...	...	1399
In Writing,	677	...	...	608
In Vocal Music,	879	...	...	284
In Geography,	523	...	...	507
In Arithmetic,	839	...	...	668
In English Grammar,	165	...	...	146
In Elocution,	187	...	...	139
In National Philosophy,	18	...	...	14
In History,	14	...	...	30
In Bookkeeping,	2	...	...	2
In Composition,	95			
In Drawing,	310			
In Algebra,	3			
In Physiology,	11			

It would be unjust to pass over the studies pursued without comment. It is worthy of remark that the fundamental branches

taught in our schools are *thoroughly* taught; that the motto seems to be, "How well," rather than "How much." The *Reading* is generally *excellent*. Perhaps in *no* city can be found a greater amount of good reading, among the same number of pupils of equal age, than here.

In articulation, accent, emphasis—in the *whole* enunciation, there is a strong evidence of an understanding of the subject, as well as propriety and beauty of expression.

In *Orthography*, correctness of expression and fulness of language are given, by slate exercises and definitions. *Singing* is a favorite exercise. It is found to be very promotive of harmony, unity and progress. The labor of the teacher is much lessened by it, particularly in governing. In *Geography*, map drawing is practised in most of the schools, as a means not only of fixing topography, but of sharpening the perceptive faculties and cultivating the taste. The lessons are not so much verbatim as understandingly recited. *Arithmetic* shows a large increase over last quarter. It is perhaps a compliment to the teachers to say that this is a favorite subject with them—that they seem to prefer it to most other branches which they are required to teach; and in teaching their pupils to think, to reach after *principles*, they are quite successful. *English Grammar* is reduced to the same rational method. The principle rather than the rule, and the reason equally with the cultivation of the memory, are what are sought for.

The text-books hitherto have been of a too miscellaneous character, and a list is given of those recommended to be used.

TEACHERS.

The teachers are now seventeen in number, and order as follows:

No. 1. Mr. J. Swett and Miss Marion Bain.

No. 2. Mr. James Denman, Miss A. E. Sandford, Mrs. E. Wright, and Mrs. S. A. Hazelton.

No. 3. Mr. E. H. Holmes, Miss H. A. Hanche, and Miss M. S. Haynes.

No. 4. Mr. Ahira Holmes, Miss S. Allyne, and Miss E. Durgin.

No. 5. Mr. H. P. Carlton, Mrs. A. W. Milbury, and Mrs. O. P. Cudworth.

No. 6. Mr. J. C. Morrill.

No. 7. Miss Clara B. Wallbridge.

Since the commencement of the Quarter, the teachers have formed themselves into a Society, called "The San Francisco Teachers' Association," and have drawn up and adopted a Constitution and code of By-Laws for their government and

regulation in the same. The object of this Association is the improvement and advancement of teachers in the *science* and *art* of their profession.

The regular meetings are held at the school-room on Washington Street, on the last Friday of every month, at 7 o'clock, P. M.; and quarterly meetings are to be held as provided for by ordinance, on the last Friday of each quarter. It is hoped and expected that the friends of the schools will attend these monthly and quarterly meetings. In connection with this a *Public School Library* should be established. This would be highly beneficial to teachers and to students of a suitable age, connected with the schools. Means for this purpose should be furnished soon, at least, to make a beginning. A generous public also will, no doubt, aid by donations of money for this laudable purpose.

QUARTERLY EXPENSES.

Teachers' Salaries, ...	$6,400.00
Rent, ...	2,361.00
Repairs and Fixtures, ...	1,795.27
Sundries,—Stoves, Furniture, Fuel, &c.,	797.86
Amounting to . . .	$11,354.13

He advises an increase of monthly appropriation to meet the growing wants of the schools,—the attendance continually increasing and requiring more teachers.

In the schools easy of access the attendance has been, not only great, but comparatively *regular*, and a large proportion of the children and youth attending are of the best and most respectable families in the city. The pupils also are more advanced in age and attainments than at any time before, since the beginning of the enterprise. New branches have been commenced and new classes formed.

With the return of the dry season there will, no doubt, be an attendance so great, that the present school buildings will not be adequate to the wants of the city.

This is worthy of the consideration of the Common Council. A liberal provision should be made as soon as possible for the permanent establishment of the schools in large, commodious and suitable buildings; for order, habits of thought, character and progress depend much upon proper outward circumstances, as well as upon the precepts and examples of competent teachers.

Besides suitable Common School buildings, a High School should be provided for. Advanced pupils are constantly arriving in the city, and daily entering the Public Schools.

Such will very soon require the facilities for acquiring more than the mere elementary branches—facilities for improvement in the higher Mathematics, the Natural Sciences, the Languages, &c. Though the Common School may and can do much for the advancement of the pupil, yet its peculiar purpose is to lay the beginning of the foundation merely. Its elements, its constitution, necessarily debar it from ascending higher in the scale than to a certain medium pitch.

A school for the Colored Population should be established. Many families are now in the city, and the number is constantly increasing. There are at present within the city limits colored children sufficient to form a school more than large enough for one teacher.

But before any school, no matter how well endowed, can be successful, all external counteracting influences must be obviated. At the present time hordes of young vagabonds daily prowl about the schools, in the streets, and throughout the city, not only wasting their own precious time for improvement, but tempting the pupils of the school to truancy and vagrancy, to idleness, mischief and wickedness.

It would be well if it were made the special duty of the Police to keep the streets clear of all children and youth of an age suitable for school, who have no visible business or employment in the streets, between the hours of 9 A. M. and 4 P. M. This would be sufficient until a House of Correction, or City or State Reform School, could be established. Perhaps it might prevent the necessity of establishing one at all, or at least for some time to come.

Thoughtful provision by those in power, the coöperation of parents and all who should take an interest; intelligence, industry, and faithfulness of teachers—will promote the interests, insure the progress, and perpetuate the existence of the people's favorite institutions.—*The Pacific.*

TEACHERS' INSTITUTES.

Mansfield,	October	2— 7.
Lee,	"	9—14.
Barre,	"	16—21.
Randolph,	"	23—28.
Franklin,	"	30—Nov. 4.